

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 and 11-14 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-9 and 11-14 have been rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1, 5, and 9 have been amended. The Applicants submit that claims 1-9 and 11-14 are in condition for allowance and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections. No new matter has been entered.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103**

Claims 1-9 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,493,702 issued to Adar et al. (hereinafter “Adar”), in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0099784A1 to Tran. The Applicants respectfully traverse the outstanding rejections and submit that claims 1-9 and 11-14 are in condition for allowance. No new matter has been entered. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the Applicants’ Specification and Figures and, in particular, on page 6, lines 1-8, page 8, lines 16-19, page 6, lines 15-19, page 7, lines 8-10, and page 7, lines 13-23.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*,  
“processing the information, the processing resulting in approved information, the processing including:

*checking to ensure that the information is complete;*  
*checking to ensure that the information is not a duplicate of information submitted by authorized system users;* and  
verifying that a user at the user client system is authorized to submit the request.”

These features are neither taught by, nor rendered obvious in view of, the cited art references either alone or in combination. The Examiner states with respect to claim 1, that Adar discloses “*checking to ensure that the information is complete*”, citing column 7, lines 1-8. The Applicants respectfully disagree. Column 7, lines 1-8 merely state that “availability and newness for each bookmark” is tracked. This is not synonymous with “*checking to ensure that the information is complete*. The two

features have very clear and distinct connotations. For example, a user of a client system may submit a request to include information into the web key tool where the information is missing, e.g., an incomplete URL or URL provided with improper syntax. By contrast, the availability and newness tracking disclosed in Adar refers to verifying to see if a link is outdated (i.e., newness) or if it is still active (“availability”). Thus, the tracking performed as disclosed in Adar does not include checking information for *completeness* as recited in the Applicants’ claims. Tran does not cure the deficiencies of Adar, as Tran does not teach or suggest this feature.

The Examiner further states that Tran teaches “checking to ensure that the information is not redundant.” The Applicant has amended this feature to recite “*checking to ensure that the information is not a duplicate of information submitted by authorized system users.*” This feature is not disclosed in either Adar or Tran, alone or in combination. Rather, Tran teaches a *personal bookmarking system* whereby the server checks “to see whether the bookmark information is already stored” (paragraph 0056). The *bookmark is particular for an individual user and is not provided as a community bookmark to network users* as recited in the Applicants’ claims. See, e.g., paragraph 0055, which states, “the server computer system may store the bookmark information in association with the particular user.” Also, storing “the bookmark information may comprise adding the bookmark information to existing bookmark information that is already stored for the user” (paragraph 0055). By contrast, as recited in amended claim 1, the duplication check seeks to identify whether the information is a duplicate of information submitted by authorized system users, where multiple users may be submitting URLs to the system. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claim 1 is not rendered obvious over Adar in view of Tran. Claims 2-4 and 13 depend from what should be an allowable base claim. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 2-4 and 13 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

Independent claims 5 and 9 have been amended in a manner substantially similar to the amendments made with respect to claim 1. For at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 1, the Applicants submit that claims 5 and 9 are also patentable over

Adar in view of Tran. Claims 6-8 and 14 depend from what should be an allowable claim 5. Claims 11 and 12 depend from what should be an allowable claim 9. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 6-8, 11, 12 and 14 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of claims 1-9 and 11-14 is respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance is requested. It is submitted that the foregoing amendments and remarks should render the case in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, as the cited references neither anticipate nor render obvious that which the Applicants deem to be the invention, it is respectfully requested that claims 1-9 and 11-14 be passed to issue.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,  
JUDY J. KOGUT-O'CONNELL ET AL.  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
Applicants' Attorneys

By: Marisa J. Dubuc  
Marisa J. Dubuc  
Registration No. 46,673  
Customer No. 29371

Date: June 29, 2006  
Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone: (860) 286-2929  
Fax: (860) 286-0115